

1488. gg 16.

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

Bishop of Cloyne's Pamphlet :

IN WHICH THE

DOCTRINE OF TITHES
IS CANDIDLY CONSIDERED,

AND PROVED TO BE

OPPRESSIVE AND IMPOLITIC :

HIS

LORDSHIP'S ARGUMENTS

FOR THE INSECURITY OF THE

PROTESTANT RELIGION,

ARE ALSO DEMONSTRATED TO BE

GROUNDLESS AND VISIONARY.

" Prelates nay Kings may flourish or may fade;
" A Breath may make them, as a Breath has made;
" But a BOLD PEASANTRY—A NATION'S PRIDE,
" If once destroy'd can never be supply'd."

GOLDSMITH.

By *AMTAS GRIFFITH, Esq.*
LATE SURVEYOR OF BELFAST, AND FORMER
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE PROVINCE
MUNSTER.

D U B L I N :

PRINTED BY T. BYRNE, PARLIAMENT-ST

M,DCC,LXXXVII.



OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

Bishop of CLOYNE's Pamphlet, &c.

SECTION I.

I KNOW by many, who are unacquainted with my UNFORTUNATE STORY, it may be deemed a solecism in me to take up the pen in defence of the Roman Catholics of this kingdom—a people to whose interests I some time since appeared hostile. I allude to the opposition I gave a party who endeavoured to obtain for them the elective franchise. The idea was novel; and I considered it urged with too much precipitancy. I must at the same time confess, from all the information I ever could collect, that the measure never originated with the Roman Catholics—the more enlightened Protestants united with the liberal and tolerant Presbyterians, in order to extend to them such indulgence. At that period I lived in habits of intimacy with the leading Gentlemen of both parties; and had the Roman Catholics made themselves active in the business it would certainly have reached my ears. I must,

therefore, perfectly acquit that people of the imprudent zeal with which they have been charged.

Perhaps it may not be unnecessary for me here to inform my readers, how my conduct was influenced, with respect to the active part I took on that occasion. When the subject first came on the tapis, I neither interfered for or against it—I entirely resigned it to the wisdom of the legislature, without considering the propriety or impropriety of the measure. Naturally the friend of all my fellow creatures, and perfectly superior to prejudices of any sort, had the question rested with me, it is more than probable, philanthropy would have influenced the scale. Arguments might be used for and against any subject; but reason—impartial reason urges emphatically the rights of human nature. However, I shall enter no further on that head at present; but just observe, that I was reluctantly led to some publications, through the artifices of one of the greatest monsters that ever appeared in the shape of man. This deceitful wretch whom I esteemed my bosom friend—but alas! he was a satire on friendship as well as on humanity, came to my house, and informed me, with tears in his eyes, that my ruin was determined on. My public conduct (which I am bold to assert was ever actuated by the purest principles of honour and patriotism) he said, had given great offence to some Gentlemen high in the estimation of the Court; but added he, “if you exert yourself against granting an extension of the elective franchise to the Roman Catholics, I am certain it will be in my power to reinstate you in their favour.”

Destitute as I was of any dependence, save the employment I held, this incendiary knew my principles

principles too well to drop a hint of this completion, but in the tone of a cringing sycophant——
 “cloathed in the garb of humility.” He was satisfied I would have spurned the idea, and considered his interference as a personal insult, and have treated it as such. But his tears and professions of friendship disarmed me; and when he represented the storm which was gathering——almost ready to overwhelm my wife, my children, and myself, I was distressed beyond measure, and suffered his advice to influence me; this I was the easier inclined to do, as I was never, as I before observed, an advocate of the measure. However, through the treachery of this scoundrel, in whom I placed the most unbounded reliance, my SHATTERED BARK was wrecked, and my family and I sunk together. It were impossible to avert our destiny, when this wretch was in the confidence of some of the first characters in the nation—and was at that very instant abusing that confidence, and exerting all his influence for our destruction. It is almost incredible there should be such a creature in human existence; but the fact is as I have simply related it:——

“ And could my feeling heart but speak,
 “ And all its pangs disclose,
 “ The melting tale your heart would break,
 “ With sympathetic woes.
 “ Alas! my throbbing bosom’s sway’d,
 “ With every tortur’d fear;
 “ And if your heart of stone was made,
 “ At least you’d drop a tear.”

However, as I intend shortly to publish the whole of my melancholy case, I shall enlarge no further on it at present, but confine myself to the
 Bishop

Bishop of Cloyne's Pamphlet. The subject is more interesting than the elective franchise; as it comprehends almost the very existence of the poor of this kingdom; for it must be observed, that there never was a period of the Irish History when its Peasantry were more wretched, or I might say, so wretched as they are at present; and instead of any prospect brightening to their view, clouds more black, and planets more malignant, are still seen rising in a perpetual succession, and darkening their horizon.

The necessities and conveniencies of life, it must be admitted by every dispassionate man, are still becoming more and more difficult to obtain. Formerly rents were moderate, and food of course plenty. Now rents are enormous, and food in a great measure beyond the means of the lower classes in many parts of the kingdom. This I know myself to be a fact, for I have had the best opportunities of informing myself in the different Provinces.

But it is unnecessary for me to point out to a judicious public the peculiar hardships under which the Irish peasantry labour—The whole kingdom is already satisfied on that subject—every one admits their oppression to be founded. First, the estated gentleman, for the consideration of an advanced premium, sets his lands to *middle-men*—beings unknown to any other soil; nay, he sets them before his poor industrious tenants have the least intimation of his design: Secondly, this middle-man grinds the face of the poor, by exacting rack rents, and giving at the same time no employment to labourers: Thirdly, the labourers hire, notwithstanding the decrease of the value of money, the increase of their

their rents, and the high price of provisions, has not been augmented these hundred years:—

Fourthly, tithes are more rigorously exacted from the poor than from the rich. The clergy are loath to exasperate wealthy men by demanding the utmost farthing of their revenues; they therefore accept a compensation from them. This compensation is reduced according to the consequence and property of the man; inasmuch that in some cases I have known it to be next to nothing. The clergy, however, have their reasons for this condescension; and the poor man pays, in proportion, fifty, nay, one hundred times more for his ridge of potatoes, than the nobility and gentry do for their crops.—

Fifthly, the impositions of tithe-farmers, tithe-proctors, &c. &c. all of whom oppress the poor and realize properties on their very vitals. Add to all those causes which combine for the wretchedness of our peasantry, that the Absentees of Ireland alone would be sufficient to keep them in a state of indigence and beggary. To think of such a number of our nobility and gentry to be constantly draining this devoted country of annual millions.—

Indeed the Irish have been always accused of indolence and want of exertion; and I believe not without some degree of reason. However if they were the most active people on earth, such a constant drain of their specie could not but be attended with the most injurious consequences.

Exclusive of all the hardships I have mentioned, the peasantry have their own clergy to support; besides hearth-money, county-cesses, church-rates, and tolls, and customs, which are frequently made jobs of. I have seen families in all parts of the kingdom, abandon their miserable dwellings, with their blanket and the pot in which they boiled their potatoes—

potatoes—all the moveables they had on earth, and hide themselves up and down the country to avoid paying hearth-money, which is only two shillings.

From the Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet, I would suppose the nation on the very point of an insurrection—the church about to be annihilated and the constitution on the verge of destruction. However his Lordship does not know the real state of the country; if he did he would not have committed himself for a production, the very idea of which should crimson his face. I know the interior state of Ireland as well as any man in the kingdom; and in the face of the world I contradict (though with all deference) his Lordship. What could be his motives for writing such a pamphlet, I am at a loss to divine. I have every reason to think the present Government is a liberal one, Secretary Orde demonstrated a disposition of uniting, rather than of dividing the inhabitants of Ireland: He stands pledged to the nation, to bring forward a system of education for our youth of all persuasions. This conduct of the Irish minister does not promise preferment or favour to the *preacher* of persecution; therefore I am at the greater loss to account for the Prelate's motives for turning writer. Truth he has not adhered to; and though in England he may obtain credit, he will be contradicted by every man who knows Ireland, and has its prosperity at heart. I consider his pamphlet a libel on the nation—injurious to its interests and derogatory to the honour of its established religion.

And here I am led to take notice of a circumstance which has recently occurred. I do not give it as a positive fact, but as a report that has been received in the city as such. A Seminary had been erected

erected in the town of Carlow, for the education of Roman Catholics, which a Protestant writer judiciously observed would prove THE TOMB OF DISTINCTIVE PREJUDICES, if properly carried into effect. This Seminary was undertaken by Doctor Delany, Titular Bishop of the diocese of Leighlin, (for it seems Doctor Keefe is superannuated). In the course of my life I never heard of a more amiable character than this Delany, though I am not personally acquainted with him; indeed I am acquainted with very few Roman Catholics.—No spot in the kingdom could be more convenient for students: However, after the building had been completed, an application was made to the Archbishop of Dublin for a licence, which he peremptorily refused, though it had been partly erected by the voluntary contributions of Protestant gentlemen: common policy should have dictated an opposite conduct to his Grace, as the prejudices which Priests acquire in foreign Colleges, would be effectually guarded against by a *native education*.

How different a policy directs the counsels of the present King of France. He published an arret, about a year since, revoking the Droit d'Aubaine, and giving toleration to foreigners of all religions to settle in France, and purchase lands. He also notified to the Baron de Creteil, President of the Royal Academy of Sciences, his pleasure, for the admission of persons of every religious denomination.—In consequence of which the Baron de Dutrich, a Lutheran, was immediately elected an associate—his Majesty confirmed his election, with the greatest satisfaction, and several other Protestants have since obtained the same honour of being elected, and confirmed by the King's authority.

Members of the Royal Academy of Sciences.—
What a contrast in the French King and the Irish
Prelate!

But to return from this digression: As an individual I must consider myself interested in the prosperity and honour of the Church of Ireland, of which I have the happiness to be a member; I cannot therefore but behold with the utmost detestation the insidious artifices employed in this enlightened age to revive obsolete prejudices. While Germany, France, and all the other Catholic states around us, afford examples of benevolence and toleration, a Prelate of the Protestant religion—*proh pudor!*—comes forward with the horn of persecution, and blows it more loud than that curate who sounded one of the Right-Boys horns on Cloghnakilty mount, as a deception to lure them about him, that he might with the assistance of his mercenaries butcher them unarmed and without their being able to make resistance. I believe the world will join in opinion with me, that it would be a more eligible pursuit for his Lordship to be writing sermons, than to assume the pen of a Wesley for the purpose of throwing the nation into a ferment. I know not of any reason why he should be so much alarmed for “the present state of the Church of Ireland—its precarious situation, and the consequent danger to the public.” It is probable I may meet his resentment for the freedom with which I must necessarily treat his opinions; however, I shall cheerfully submit to that misfortune in the cause of TRUTH; solemnly declaring at the same time, that I have no object whatever in view by this publication, but the interests of my native country, and the honour of my religion, both of which I consider
materially

materially affected by the Prelates imprudent and ill-timed production.

His appeal is entirely to the *passions*—not to the understanding of his readers; and he hopes to gain profelytes to his opinion by working on prejudices, which humanity should rather sink still deeper than draw from their oblivion. Every argument he made use of, has been employed a hundred times before and for a *very laudable* purpose—that of stirring up father against son—brother against brother—and confounding the feelings and ties of nature, in bigotry and party zeal. It is natural he should wish to keep the people *bood-winked*; but his pride, if the sacredness of his habit had no influence, should keep him superior to a meanness that is only fit for such a fanatic as Wesley. By solid argument, as I shall immediately prove, he could never defend so impolitic a law as Tithes; he almost forgot the dignity of his character in the magnitude of his terror for the decrease of his revenue.

That Tithes are a grievance—that they are repugnant to the laws of God—and could have no foundation but in ignorance and superstition—that a commutation is indispensibly requisite—and that the honour of the Clergy and the interests of Religion call aloud for a commutation; I trust I shall be able to prove to the perfect satisfaction of every impartial reader.

Tithes, according to the Ecclesiastical law, are defined to be the Tenth Part of the annual profits of lands, cattle, and personal industry of the inhabitants. The first species is called *predial*, as of corn, grass, wood, &c.—the second *mixed*, as wool, milk, fowl, pigs, &c.

——the third *personal*, as of manual occupations, trades, fisheries, &c.——of all which a tenth part, agreeable to the letter of the Ecclesiastical law, belongs *jure divino*, to the Clergy. Is it necessary for me here to declare such a tax to be an imposition on mankind? Can any person read it without accounting it infamous? For my part I am astonished at the ignorance and credulity of Protestants, in retaining one of the most important errors that ever crept into the Church of Rome——an error that has been the source of all that superstition and episcopal tyranny which occasioned the reformation. Did the Clergy however dare to exact Tithes agreeable to their own definition of the word, there is not a merchant, manufacturer, tradesman, or artificer, from the highest to the lowest, in any part of the British Empire, but they might with equal propriety call on for an annual tenth of their profits, as they do on the miserable peasantry for a tenth of their ridge of potatoes. Nay more, I apprehend there is not a gentleman in office, from the Lord Chancellor down to a supernumerary gauger, but they might demand of, a tenth of their yearly salary and perquisites. I appeal to their definition of the word *Tithes*, and then to the candour of my readers.

Since then the Clergy, agreeable to their laws, are entitled to a tenth part of the annual profits and emoluments of every man in the dominions, why, in God's name, do they not demand their *just right*? They tell us, we are bound *ex conscientio*, to pay them their *lawful* dues; therefore, it must be sinful in us to withhold any part of what *their laws* define to belong to them. I am afraid, at this rate, we have very few who merit *canonization* at their hands. Christian Charity for the sake of
our

our souls, should induce them to *revise* their laws; for otherwise I am certain, as commerce will be found to increase under the auspices of the illustrious Granby's descendant, the sins of the nation will multiply with its riches. No man will voluntarily give up to their use a tenth of his yearly profits, &c. notwithstanding the *sin* he may incur by retaining it. The Clergy ought to demand all their revenues and employ Tithe Farmers, Proctors, and Constables to collect them in the Metropolis as well as in the mountains. The law which sanctions the one, sanctions the other, since its original meaning extends to all without a shadow of distinction.—My readers, however, will impute, I dare say, their *extreme moderation* in this respect, to reasons very different from *generosity*, as their conduct in few instances can be *reproached* with such *indiscretion*—the contrary has ever been the badge of the sanctuary.

Tithes commenced and ceased with the Jewish Theocracy. If they were ever established *jure divino*, it certainly was at that period. I shall not take upon me to prove they were not established *jure divino*; because it is in the first place unnecessary; and in the second, though I should demonstrate they were not as clear as the day light, still I should be liable to contradiction; for as Shakespeare observes, the Devil could wrest texts of Scripture to his purpose. My object is to keep simply to the fact, that they have not been established in the New Law by Jesus Christ, or any of his Apostles—of this I am as satisfied as I am of my existence—and so is every man of the least information, notwithstanding all the sophistry of all the Divines in the World, to support the contrary.

Jesus

Jesus Christ preached a different doctrine—he had not a place to lay his head. Merciful God! can those men be your true and faithful disciples, whom I behold in the most superb carriages, basking in all the luxuries of life? Can they be the preachers of your word?—You who were meek and humble of heart—who recommended to your followers, poverty and a desertion of the good things of this World? Can I suppose you ordained them to spread more wretchedness than you ever intended to chasten offending man with?—Or can I suppose it is merely for your love and honour, that they now tremble for a diminution of their enormous dues? No, my God, I will never believe it. My idea of thy perfections is too elevated.

Gentle reader, forgive me this apostrophe!

From the time Tithes ceased with the Jewish Theocracy, we never hear of their existing any where, till the Church fell into errors and extravagancies. During her primitive purity, mention was never made of them. But when temporal Politics blended with Religion—when the Clergy instead of the Pulpit, began to harangue in the Councils of Kings—when they began to devise plans for a domination over the World, far more tyrannical than that of antient Rome, then it was that Tithes were introduced as the grand means of accomplishing their ends. Is it not evident, hence, that Tithes are repugnant to the laws of God? Surely, if the Teacher of Religion meant that so important a tax should be established on mankind, for the maintenance of Clergy, he would in some instance have intimated his design. The contrary, however, is evident from every sentence that fell
from

from his lips. St. Paul, the most learned and sublime of his Apostles, with his own hands laboured for a livelihood, and recommended his example to others. How then, can any man seriously tell me, that Tithes were instituted *jure divino*?

I before observed I would not defend the idea of Tithes not having originated *jure divino*, in the Jewish Theocracy. But admitting that was the case, I trust my readers are satisfied they were never countenanced by the Messiah; and therefore were never instituted by divine right in the Christian system. I must remark also that in the Jewish Theocracy, the Poor were always intitled to their part of Tithes, and the persons who paid them were entertained by the priesthood.

Before Tithes were introduced in England, Charlemagne established them in France, very differently from the present plan. He divided them into four parts. The first part was appropriated to maintain the edifice of the Church;—the second, to support the poor;—the third, to support the bishops;—and, the fourth, the Parochial Clergy.

What period Tithes were introduced into England, has not been rightly ascertained; however, on their first introduction every man had a liberty of paying them to what clergymen he pleased, which was called arbitrary consecration of Tithes; But after the different dioceses had been divided into parishes, the Tithes of each parish were then allotted to its respective masters—Arbitrary consecrations however took place again, and were in general use until the reign of King John; this was
owing

owing probably to the intrigues of those who were called the regular Clergy, or Monks of the Benedictine and other orders. These Monks by assuming a greater degree of sanctity than the secular Clergy, hoped to draw all ecclesiastical profits to their *own coffers*:—This will account for the number and the riches of the Monasteries and religious houses which were founded in those days, and which were frequently endowed with Tithes—For as a lay-man was obliged to pay Tithes, and had power either to pay them to *Regulars* or *Seculars*; they generally pressed the former—It was also deemed good-policy for a great man in those times to build an ABBEY, and pay Tithes to his Monks, or else grant them to some Abbey already erected: Since for this donation which cost the patron little or nothing, he might (according to the superstition of the times, which in fact gave birth to Tithes) have masses offered up for his soul to the very end of time:—This then was the grand inducement for preferring the *Regulars* to the *Seculars*.—By these ARBITRARY CONSECRATIONS of Tithes, the parish Clergy in process of time became miserably poor, till Pope-Innocent the third, about the year 1200 sent a DECRETAL LETTER to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to relieve the Secular Clergy: This letter has been mistaken by some writers, and amongst the rest by Sir Henry Hobart, for a decree of the council of Latheran, held in 1179.

I think it might here be asked with propriety, why a Pope's letter, or even a decree of the council of Latheran, should be received in the British empire with all the force of an Act of Parliament? Does it not prove still clearer and clearer, that an abridgment of the clergy's authority and revenues was indispensable? Sir Edward Coke indeed has asserted,

asserted, that it bound not the lay subjects of the realm but being reasonable and just, it was allowed of and so become *lex terra*. I do not rightly comprehend Sir Edward, I believe; for if the Pope's letter became *lex terra*, I think the lay subjects were bound by it to all intents and purposes—facts speak for themselves—it put an effectual stop to all arbitrary consecrations of Tithes from that day to the period of the reformation.

I would not wish at all to be understood as arguing against the propriety of a decent provision for our established clergy—Some mode of maintenance is necessary; but I contend for it that a more eligible one might be adopted than Tithes, however sanctioned by antiquity or custom, which is all the warmest advocates of the clergy can say in the behalf of Tithes. There was a time antiquity or custom, would preclude enquiry; but people are not so easily *convinced* at present. By their functions the Clergy are supposed to be estranged from the world, without opportunities of providing for themselves—dedicating their whole time to the cure of souls. Trice happy would it be for the nation were this the case!—the contrary alas! is but too apparent.

But is it not a sufficient reason for abolishing Tithes and substituting some other mode of maintenance, that they render the Clergy perfectly odious throughout the kingdom? Travel through any part of the nation, East, West, North, or South, and you will hear of nothing but execrations against that respectable body. Of what efficacy then can all their writings and preachings be?—is not the very end of their mission thus effectually destroyed? It is in vain that they tell me they are

C

propagating

propagating sound morals and religion amongst the laity, and making converts and penitents by precept and example.—I know too well to hearken to such a tale, that they are held in the most despicable point of view—equally so with their Tithe-Farmers, Proctors and Constables. The sacred habit should no more be suspected, of rapine or extortion, than the wife of Cæsar of her chastity—for whatever operates pernicious to religion should be guarded against as a real evil. The obnoxious business of a Tax-gatherer is but ill-suited to their dignity or function, who should be supported in a manner the least burthensome and most convenient to the people; and not be exposed to contests perpetually with their parishioners, whose good opinion and affections it is their immediate duty to cultivate.

It is very remarkable that the established Clergy in Scotland, in the United Provinces and the Swiss Cantons, are infinitely more respected, and in fact more useful than the established Clergy in England or Ireland. The reason is obvious—Tithes, that destructive remnant of popery, are abolished in the former countries, but retained in the latter. In them countries, however, a decent moderate competence is provided for their Clergy, which though far inferior to those on our establishment in general, is nevertheless adequate to all their wants and wishes; and they are much more famed for their learning and piety than our Clergy, and consequently have a greater ascendancy over their respective flocks, and enjoy the pleasing reflection of having their instructions attended to with a veneration and awe seldom felt by our laity, or inspired by our Clergy.

The

The established Clergy of Scotland, than whom, none are more eminent for the purity of their manners, and, at the same time, influence amongst the people, have but very moderate salaries. Their entire revenue, including their Glebe or Churchlands, and the rents of their manſes, does not exceed the revenues of five or ſix of our Biſhops; on which however very nearly a thouſand Clergymen, (944) as reſpectable for learning, piety and uſefulneſs, as any in the world, ſubſiſt, decently and independently. Is not this a clear demonſtration, that it is not an imenſe revenue that the dignity of the church can be beſt ſupported by?—Thoſe Clergy can only maintain reſpect, who are not ſubjected to be conſtantly in litigation with their pariſhioners, nor to be deemed a public burthen. The Scotch Clergy are happy in this reſpect, and maintain that influence over the minds of the multitude, which can only enable them to perform their duties properly.—This will alſo in a great meaſure account for the very few diſſenters from their Church, that have ever been known, while ſwarms from ours are perpetually taking place.

In the nature of things there muſt ever be a general prejudice againſt Tithes, becauſe the intereſt of all the laity is affected by them; therefore, admitting for argument's ſake, that they are not oppreſſive, ſtill it is evident they are impolitic. I do not aſſert that the whole body of the Clergy are guilty of avarice and extortion. God forbid, human nature was ſo depraved! There are many of them exemplary in their conduct; and many of them the reverſe. However, I will not point out a ſingle individual for cenſure or crimination.

In every community there are good and bad ; and the Clergy are only men like others, subject to all the weaknesses and passions of humanity. I am by no means an advocate of insurrection or outrage of any kind ; nor do I think Tithes oppressive as they really are, can justify violations of the law. The Constitution has pointed out the proper road for redress—by petition to the Legislature ; and this much I will say that many poor Clergymen would be highly gratified and benefitted also by a reform. Illegal violence in this case tends to defeat its own object ; and those estated Gentlemen, in a certain county particularly, who have exerted themselves in fanning an imprudent zeal should reflect that they themselves might perish in the conflagration.

In England, a Commutation for Tithes will undoubtedly take place. Bishop Watson, that benevolent man, perceives the urgent necessity of such a measure, and will do all that in him lies, to carry it into effect. Earl Bathurst is also said to be preparing the outlines of the bill, so that we may shortly expect to hear of a reformation in their mode of maintaining their established Clergy. Indeed reforms of this complexion seem at present to be engaging most States in Europe, where Tithes have been continued. Even in France, whose established Church is daily forging shackles for millions of the human species, the Clergy are seriously employed in suppressing the Collegiates and every other Prebends annexed to Churches that are not Archiepiscopal, in order to apply the income of these Livings to those of the inferior Clergy, which body is there, as in these kingdoms, in a most wretched situation. Besides, this revolution in the Gallican church, another kind of livings

livings called Priors, the revenues of which are immense, will be taken out of the hands of their present possessors, and made over to the more useful classes—the poor distressed Clergy.

Hence we may reasonably suppose the Legislature of Ireland will not treat with indifference a subject of such importance as Tithes, when all Europe perceives their injurious tendency. A gentleman of very disinterested principles will shortly introduce a bill into the House of Commons for a Commutation. A popular Northern Prelate has countenanced the measure. Its necessity is apparent—the Nation demands it, and the voice of the Nation must be heard.

Need I say any more, candid reader, to convince you, that Tithes originated in the darker ages of ignorance and superstition—that they are in themselves an imposition and a grievance—and that justice and policy demands some other provision for the Clergy?—Justice demands that there should not be so great a distinction between the emoluments of the Clergy—Justice demands that the unhappy Curate (whose virtue, piety, and learning are frequently far superior to a Prelate's, or a pampered Rector's) should have the means of supporting himself, and not be left to famish with a helpless, and perhaps numerous family, as I know many of them are; while Bishops are enabled to vie with Roman Cardinals, in magnificence and splendor—while they revel in stately palaces, and indulge all their appetites in every enjoyment, luxury, and epicurism,——while they Lord it over their Fellow Creatures without mercy, —Justice, I say, demands the revenues of the Church should be more equally distributed—that

one

one man should not possess yearly thousands, and another little more than the pay of one of our Police Constables, though infinitely more industrious in the vineyard. Policy demands that the people should not be made to feel the Clergy a scourge to them instead of the intended blessing—Policy demands that there should ever exist a good understanding between the Clergy and the Laity, and that the influence of the former should have proper weight with the latter. The dearest interests of Religion are involved in the question of Tithes; should they be madly continued, it requires not a depth of penetration to foresee, that the period is not distant, when it will fall into utter disrepute.

From my heart I feel for the situation of the Curates of this kingdom; and I would administer to their necessities, were it in my power. The troubles of the South are also to be lamented—and if the sword of justice were not suspended by humanity for their poverty, hardships and oppressions, Government would be warranted in a more rigorous conduct. Lord Luttrell has behaved nobly—his benevolence should never be forgot. He knows the miseries of the poor are not fictitious, and he will give a helping hand to relieve them. He will not be led astray by the high sounding words of rebellion and insurrection;—he is, I am persuaded, acquainted with the human heart, and cannot be ignorant that there is a degree of oppression—a degree of tyranny beyond which human nature cannot bear.

SECTION II.

I SAID that Tithes were oppressive and impolitic, and I am confident I have proved the assertion to the satisfaction of every candid, dispassionate man. I shall now proceed to demonstrate that all the Prelate's arguments for the insecurity of the Protestant Religion are groundless and visionary; which I will soon convince, all who can be convinced by fair reasoning. I am sorry I shall be under the necessity of delivering my sentiments rather freely; but I declare in the face of the world, and in the most solemn manner, that I have not in my bosom the least particle of ill-will for his Lordship. When he committed himself to paper, on a subject of the last importance to the nation, and publicly avowed himself the author of that production, he put himself on a level with every Gentleman in the kingdom, who had abilities and inclination to enter with him into the lists of disputation. Therefore it would be highly ungenerous to expect I should be tenacious of combating his arguments, because they are HIS—in every contest, whatever weapons are employed, a liberty of using them is the right of each combatant. The Prelate and I fight, not with swords, but with pens. He, I may say, gave the first blow—a blow against toleration

toleration and liberality; I feel myself interested, if not injured, in the stigma cast on my religion, in the eyes of the learned world, by a Bishop's broaching such a doctrine—I feel myself interested in the cause of truth, which I hasten to shew has been glaringly perverted.

I am perfectly of opinion with the Americans, (whom his Lordship reflects on, and misrepresents) that civil polity can be easily separated from, and rendered perfectly independent of religion; and I beg leave to assure his Lordship there are amongst the Americans as wise legislators as the world can produce, some of whom stand as eminent in the republic of letters as his Lordship, notwithstanding the haste with which he has *drawn up* so *sublime* a pamphlet. I really cannot conceive any importance ecclesiastics can add to the civil constitution of this kingdom. Certain it is, the Clergy have exerted themselves continually to blend the one with the other. It is notorious they trust themselves into all corporations, canvass for all elections, and as are distinguished for party zeal, as the most venal tool of administration on the one hand, or Messrs. Binns and Tandy on the other. Point out to me a contested election where the Clergy have not been concerned, and made use of every stratagem that loyalty and disaffection could dictate, to obtain their ends. Do we not see them throughout the entire kingdom the Alpha and the Omega?—Mayors, Sovereigns, Portreeves, Borgomasters, Justices of the Peace, &c. &c. Besides they are more remarkably officious in every other person's business, than the Dissenting Ministers, Presbyterian Clergy, or Roman Catholic Priests, who for the most part, pay more attention to their respective flocks.

flocks. *Temporals* not *Spirituals*, attract the attention of the established Clergy, and Tithes are the source of this, and of every matter almost that has been urged against them. Is it not notorious, that the poorest Curate, (though he has a wife and family to maintain, upon fifty pounds a year) will be ambitious enough to apply for, and take out the Commission of the Peace; and *pour quoi?*—that he may have a power to tyrannize and lord it over the *Peasantry* of the parish he officiates in;—that he may have authority to call out the Army, inveigle the half-starved, naked labourers about him with the sound of an horn, and then leave them lifeless on the plain;—this transaction happened in the very county where his Lordship resides, as did another, similar to it in the county of Tipperary;—but his Lordship casts a *veil* over the cruelties of the Established Clergy, and only shews one side of the picture.

I ask his Lordship, whether it would not be much better for his brethren of the Established Church, to follow the example of those *Dissenting Clergy*, whom he so much dreads and reprobates, by merely minding the cure of souls?—by adhering strictly to the functions of their sacred offices? and, “by doing their duty in that state of life, unto which it had pleased God to call them?” than by cruelly butchering their parishioners, and sending them out of the world unprepared, “with all their sins upon their heads”

But I would be happy to know why the Bishop should call ROMAN CATHOLICS DISSENTERS?—I believe he will find that we have dissented from THEM, not they from us, and the PRESBYTERIANS &c. from us;—Nor did I ever hear them called

D

Dissenters

Dissenters until I read that very *alarming* and *affecting Pamphlet*. His Lordship also says, that in the coronation oath the King swears, that "He shall, to the utmost of his power, maintain the Protestant Religion, as by law established;—and preserve to the BISHOPS and CLERGY, and to the Churches committed to their care, all such RIGHTS and PRIVILEGES, as by law do, or shall appertain to them, or any of them."——I will grant his Lordship that this is the tenor of the oath, but would be glad to ask him, who framed it?——No doubt on it the PRIMATE of all England;—the ARCH-BISHOP of Canterbury, and the rest of the learned Prelates;—and let the Clergy alone for taking care of themselves:——Even now we find how terrified a noble Prelate appears to be at the commotions of a few naked, illiterate, half-starved Peasants, who denounce vengeance as much against THEIR OWN PASTORS—as ours; and seem not to make the smallest distinction.

The Bishop in a paroxysm of rage declares, that "the moment is *critical*; it is decisive of the Protestant interest."—What a *poor interest* would the Protestant interest be if it could be overturned or even shook by a few wretches in the South of Ireland, not one in a hundred of whom I will be sworn possesses twenty-shillings—or twenty-shillings worth in the world.

But why does his Lordship lug in the Dissenters by the head and shoulders?—Surely they are *very peateable*:——The *Northern Dissenters* are not only perfectly quiet, but are also of such liberal sentiments, that they wish ill to none, but unite in bonds of friendship with all the world;—they look to the

man—not to his place of worship; and would as heartily contribute to build a *Chapel* as a *Church*, or a *Church* as a *Meeting-house*, was there occasion: And this they have very recently proved in the town of Belfast, where I *myself* collected a great deal of money towards the erecting of an elegant Chapel, which is now thoroughly finished. His Lordship's average of the Church livings in the diocese of Raphoe, may be very right—provided they were divided with any degree of just proportion; but I will engage that whilst some of the Clergy in that diocese are drawing out wretched existences, others are rolling in their gilt carriages worth annual thousands.—His Lordship insists upon Divine Right for the tenure of Tithes. I request to know whether 'tis by Divine Right that the Bishops hold their Bishop's lands, and the Rectors, Vicars, &c. hold their Glebe lands and houses? Throughout all the Scriptures I never heard of a Bishop's lease, a Parsonage House, or Glebe Lands.

His Lordship inveighs bitterly against the insults offered to the established Clergy, and the little respect paid to them; all the answer I can make to this is, that I have ever thought most of them have been paid more respect than they deserved: But,
 “ if Clergymen would avoid contempt, let them
 “ avoid the causes of it, let them not be maintain-
 “ ing eternal claims to worldly power and grandeur;
 “ let them not be hunting after honors, courting
 “ preferments, and bustling for riches: Let them
 “ not be assuming to give models of human go-
 “ vernment, or to adjust and determine the titles
 “ of Princes: Let them not pretend to punish any
 “ man for his way of worship: Let them not join
 “ in factions, nor foment rebellions: Let them not
 “ defy Heaven by swearing falsely: Let them not

“ promote servitude and slavery in the people, and
 “ barbarity in the Government; and let them not
 “ flatter wicked ministers, and plague and disturb
 “ good and honest ones. Let them win respect
 “ and wear it; but let them not earn infamy, and
 “ demand veneration.—Let not those of them,
 “ who gratify *brutish appetites*, and living in all
 “ vileness, add want of shame to their want of
 “ grace, and bewail that they are contemned, while
 “ they are deserving it.—If a man pretending to
 “ great gravity and regard, should dress himself
 “ up in a *fool's coat*, and a *pair of horns*, would
 “ not people laugh at him in spite of themselves?
 “ And would not his resentment and rebukes add
 “ still to their mirth? A clergyman who goes to
 “ a *Fox-chase* and gets *drunk* on Saturday, will but
 “ with an ill-grace, talk of his dignity and am-
 “ bassadorship on Sunday. Ought we to reverence
 “ that man as our guide to Heaven, who is him-
 “ self going a contrary road, and is rioting in those
 “ vices which his whole duty should be to re-
 “ strain?”—So much for the INDEPENDANT
 WHIG, by which we may easily perceive that the
 ESTABLISHED CLERGY were no better in the year
 thirty-two, than in the year eighty-seven.

The RIGHT REV. BISHOP is however (not-
 withstanding his prejudice against dissenters, and
 their very great influence) pleased to allow that the
 established Clergy are better supported in the pro-
 vince of Ulster, than in either the provinces of
 Munster or Conaught; hear his own words: In
 “ the province of Ulster, indeed, much has been
 “ done to remedy this evil (*i. e.* the want of a suf-
 “ ficient number of Churches) by the judicious and
 “ unwearied attention of its excellent metropolitan;
 “ and the ardour with which the Suffragans and
 “ Clergy

" Clergy of that province have seconded his zeal.
 " Not only many new Churches have been erected
 " within these twenty years, but likewise such a
 " number of decent Glebe-houses, as bear unequi-
 " vocal testimony, that the Clerical Revenues have
 " contributed their full share to the improvement
 " of that part of the kingdom."——Yes, my
 Lord, though that province is full of OPULENT
 DISSENTERS, yet you are pleased to own (notwith-
 standing that these people may overturn Church and
 State) that the Established Church thrives better
 there than in any other part of Ireland: Wherefore
 then your apprehensions lest the Dissenters should
unmitre you? Oh! I am greatly afraid that his
 Lordship not only wrote in a *great hurry*, but in a
great passion; else there would have been more con-
 sistency in his *apprehensions*.

His Lordship in another place asserts, that " the
 " Roman Catholics in Munster and Conaught,
 " (who compose the bulk of the parishioners) are
 " in general but little inclined to accommodate the
 " Rector or his Curate with a lodging; on which
 " account they are frequently under the necessity
 " of residing at a distance, inconvenient for even
 " the stated weekly duties of their office, and abso-
 " lutely incompatible with an attendance, such as
 " the circumstances of their parish would require:"
 Here with both hands I must differ with his Lord-
 ship, they are the most hospitable, generous peo-
 ple on earth in Munster and Conaught; nor could
 you pay them a greater compliment, than accept-
 ing of every possible accommodation they could give
 you: They would never ask you what persuasion
 you were of? nor would they care; your society
 alone (if sociable and agreeable) would make them
 happy.——His Lordship, I presume, would not
 choose

choose that his Rector or Curate should accept of accommodations from the wretched White-Boys of Munster, and yet even they would share whatever they had ; and one of them miserable peasants would welcome any *Human Being* to his horrid pig-stye, suffer him to lye down upon the same dirty wad of straw or searn with himself, his pig (if he had one) and his naked, shivering, and half-famished family ; and he would freely share his breakfast, dinner and supper, which he and family take all at once—a frugal meal indeed, consisting of potatoes, salt and water ; and should Providence send them a leek, or an onion to cut in the water, it would make them “ bless their stars and count it luxury.”

But I fear such lodging and such viands and beverage, would but ill-suit the gorged stomach of the bloated Rector, however, they might be adopted to the poor Curate's taste.

Though I so pointedly attack a set of men, whose respectability should preclude, in the opinion of some, any idea of censure or crimination, I am willing to allow many of them to be truly exemplary. But the numbers comparatively with those of other communions, I fear would be found very trifling. His Lordship, however, will probably tell the public, as he did with respect to O'Leary, that I compliment but to depreciate, and commend but to destroy, as Marc Antony did in his oration against Brutus. However, I give him free leave to put what construction he may on my words—all I have in view is the general good of my country ; and I declare, I shall not be backward in bestowing on him that tribute of applause, which he indirectly claims for his Pamphlet,

Pamphlet, if he again comes forward, and by a fair chain of reasoning overturns my arguments.

I must confess my astonishment is great, that the learned Bishop should even insinuate that the principles of the Presbyterian church were hostile to monarchy. Have not the people of Scotland given sufficient proof to the world of the attachment of Presbyterians to the unfortunate Stuart family? Is there a house in Scotland, of any note, that has not shed its best blood in supporting that arbitrary race? How have they bled for Charles II. when they had it in their power to form themselves into a republic! How have they bled for the Son and Grandson of James II! That their attachment was not owing to an admiration of the hereditary virtues of the House of Stuarts is unnecessary to be stated; for while they were ready to die for a branch of that family, they all united in reprobating the councils and measures which banished them from the throne. What could this be owing to, but the purest spirit of loyalty that ever warmed the bosom of a brave people?

In one page of this *consistent* Pamphlet, we are told, that "despotic states, whether the supreme power was lodged in one or a few, have found in the papal authority, a congenial system of arbitrary dominion, and of course have regarded Popery as a powerful ally, or at least an useful engine of state." And in the very next, again, "In England, from whence our establishments were copied, the system of conformity between the ecclesiastical and civil constitution seems to have been studied with a peculiar degree of exactness: they were formed so precisely on the same model that the whole was likened to a double

" ble cone, united by the authority of the crown ;
 " and so essential was the preservation of the
 " Church esteemed to the welfare of the state,
 " that the Barons when they were laying the foun-
 " dation of English liberty, made it the first arti-
 " cle in *Magna Charta*, that the Church of Eng-
 " land shall be free, and enjoy her whole rights and
 " liberties inviolable."

I would be glad to know, does the learned Pre-
 late suppose the people are so ignorant at this en-
 lightened period, as to think the Barons were Pro-
 testants, or the Church of England, the same as
 at present. If he does, and indeed any dispassi-
 nate man who reads the two pages I allude to
 [10, 11,] would infer as much, I can inform
 him he is egregiously mistaken. The Barons were
 bigotted Papists, though my noble antagonist has
 deprived all Papists of every idea of affection
 for the *natale solum*——and has represented
 their church as an engine calculated for forging
 chains for humanity. Is not this a contradiction
 as palpable as can be conceived? and are not all
 the conclusions that his genius could extort from
 hence, perfectly puerile?

King John incurred the displeasure of the
 Clergy; he disputed their authority, and curtailed
 or attempted to curtail their revenues. In return,
 he was the object of their determined vengeance,
 and Priests and Friars were set on by their superiors
 to excite commotions against his government.
 The Barons from the affronts they had frequently
 received from John, were ripe for entering into
 any measures to depress him. It is no wonder
 then that when he perceived the authority of the
 church could shake his throne, that he should sub-
 mit to any thing the clergy thought proper to
 dictate.

dictate. Hence the provision in *Magna Charta* for the support of the church—not the church of England, as by law established, but the church of Rome. With what propriety the Bishop advances this circumstance in defence of the doctrine of Tithes for the Clergy of the present day, I shall not decide, but only refer to the public for their impartial opinion. Every man who is conversant in the history of England, is satisfied the clergy could have easily pulled down John from the throne, and as easily have raised up any favourite they approved of, to that seat of royalty. The king's compliance, therefore, in this instance is only to be attributed to the extravagant powers the clergy of those days exercised over the souls and bodies of his subjects.

But the king signed the paper—therefore posterity should submit. Call in first, my Lord, the Roman Catholic clergy, before your argument can have any weight. It was to that body they were specially granted, by the very charter you quote, which was extorted by the Papists whom you have defined as a mere machine for arbitrary dominion.

One observation more on his use of *Magna Charta*—it is implied, that, because the king signed an instrument in favour of the church, that instrument should be regarded as sacred as our dearest liberties;—that the interests of religion require the revenues of the church should be supported according to the very letter of that (extorted) instrument. This is laid down as an axiom—however, I shall beg leave to investigate it a little. In the first place, I assert the dignity of the church *ought* not nor *can* be dependent on immense revenue—I mean the dignity implied on the doctrine

of Christ : in the next place, though the king was not even compelled by necessity to come into the measures of the clergy, still he could not make terms for posterity. If he did, the Crown of England would be in the gift of the Pope ; because the same king gave up his Crown to the Pope, and received it again, after it had been detained some days, from the hands of the Pope's Nuncio, whose insolence to the King can be only exceeded by the ambition of those who assert Tithes are indispensable for our salvation.

When I consider the conduct of that King, and the disgrace he brought on the kingdom, I must own, I feel emotions working in my bosom, which require resolution to suppress. His dastard soul led him to every meanness—he brought down contempt on his subjects—he resigned his crown to the church, and with the abject spirit of a slave, received it again, as a gift from the hands of a man whom he should have hanged for high treason.

I absolutely feel my face in a glow this moment, that the timidity of a coward, should be employed as a reason to convince me of the legality of Tithes. How weak must be that cause, when an ingenious pen is drove to such petty shifts to defend it ! I contend, he might as well attempt to prove, that the King is dependent on the Church, instead of the Church on the King, as to endeavour to convince any rational being that John's acquiescing to the conditions proposed to him, entitle *ipso facto* Protestant clergymen to Tithes in those countries. He gave his Crown to the Pope—he gave sanction to Tithes. For the former deed he was a poltroon—a mean spirited wretch ; as to the latter, I shall not say his generosity was impolitic ;—he made friends

friends of a powerful body, without injuring himself—it was his subjects who were made to feel the effects of his pusillanimity. The learned Prelate has positively affirmed, that the ecclesiastical establishment is interwoven with the civil; whence he argues, that the Papist must, from their principles, be inimical to a free constitution; though he relates a few lines before, that we owe the foundation of our liberties to their exertions. I really am ashamed at this uncandid manner of treating the Roman Catholics—but it is the hacknied ground that has been gone over by every man who took up the pen to depreciate them—with respect to whom indeed I have not observed an original thought in his entire pamphlet.

How alarming must these words sound to all who love their country,—“the moment is critical —it is decisive of the Protestant interest.” But when we come to enquire what it is that renders it critical and decisive, all our fears vanish like a vapour:—

“This is the crisis, and the crisis now!

“The Sow hath pigg’d, and pigged hath

“the Sow.”

Yes, I trust the moment is critical and decisive, of the enormous dues which were so rigorously exacted from my more wretched fellow creatures. He said the subject was delicate, I do not, however, perceive that he has treated it very *delicately*. I grant whatever relates to SELF, should be mentioned with *delicacy*. Has he done so, in endeavouring, to *touch* landed gentlemen in the *tenderest point*—when he not only would rouse the Protestant government, but ring the

alarm through all the British empire, to draw down vengeance on a peasantry, who are the most despicable that can be found in any kingdom in Europe?

But the outrages of the White Boys are not confined to Tithes—they extend to the persons of the established clergy. This is a very severe charge—I would almost adjudge to death for such an offence, were there no circumstance of palliation; however, I have always made it a rule, and I wish every one in the world would do the same—and that is to receive the account of any offence with a degree of caution, proportioned to its enormity. A clergyman who is instrumental in the death of men, it is but natural to suppose will be subjected to the resentment of surviving relations;—poverty does not change the feelings of the heart. I don't say the peasantry would be justified by any means for offering personal insult, though it might have been provoked; but, I say, certain circumstances will very much alter the complexion of crimes. I think the charge should have been better substantiated; lest these sheets might fall into the hands of those who have not read the Bishop's pamphlet, I shall transcribe his note, for the gratification of my readers, as well as in justice to the Gentleman whose opinions I oppose, for I should be exceedingly concerned, should I have the misfortune to take an improper advantage of him.

“ In the diocese of Cloyne, seven Rectors of
 “ Parishes, hitherto constantly resident, have
 “ applied to the Ordinary for leave to absent
 “ themselves from well-grounded apprehensions
 of

"of personal danger; three of whom are so reduced in their incomes from a competency of two or three hundred pounds a year, that they do not receive a curate's salary; and of course divine service is discontinued. It is obvious that by a similar proceeding, the White Boys have it in their power to suppress entirely the Protestant religion in Munster, Conaught, and even Leinster, Dublin excepted."

This, candid readers, is a charge of the utmost magnitude, and as such, should be handed to the public properly authenticated.—The more atrocious the deed, the greater should our doubts be, until genuine authority stamped its veracity.—Seven Rectors of parishes to have applied for leave of absence is by no means extraordinary. Alas! nothing is more common throughout the whole kingdom.—But to have urged its necessity on a plea of personal danger, for which they had nothing to adduce but *apprehensions*—mere suspicions, is rather futile, when stripped of the terrific dress his Lordship's abilities gave it. Can the unsuspecting credulity of nonage receive such a report in the light it has been represented?—To pay it any attention would be a prostitution of the human understanding. The word, *well-grounded* is applied to their apprehensions—different people will form different opinions of men and things, therefore the public should have been made acquainted how far their apprehensions were well-grounded. There are men who tremble at the shadow of danger from a certain impulse of nature—there are men who would not hesitate to render, even at the expense of truth, an excuse for following their darling inclinations as feasible as possible—to one or both of those causes I will attribute their conduct, until I receive better information

mation than the *ipse dixit* even of a Prelate, especially when he is evidently under the guidance of prejudice—especially when he must make the cause his own, and argue as a judge, counsellor, juror and plaintiff. But as to the idea of their being reduced from two or three hundred a year, below the paltry pittance even of a curate, it is so very preposterous, that I should almost be ashamed to contradict it.—On that head I shall only call on any man in the kingdom to mention the names of such Rectors and their parishes; and I thus pledge myself to the nation, that I will investigate his dues and prove them in no instance to be curtailed one-fifth, of what they had been at any former period; therefore, divine service cannot be discontinued on that account any where. But, admitting these promises to be just, how is it obvious that the White Boys have it in their power to suppress entirely the Protestant religion in Munster, Conaught, and even Leinster, Dublin excepted: Good God, can any man, with a serious countenance assert such a thing?—Can he risque his candor and consistency with the public by telling them in a solemn tone, that the most wretched peasantry under the Sun can extirpate the national religion, in the teeth of the legislature, who has an army of Protestants, powerful enough to awe into subjection the most stubborn subjects in the world? How is it possible that Right Boys could extirpate it in Cork, Limerick, Clonmel, Cashel, Waterford, Kilkenny, or, in short, in any Garrison Town throughout the Kingdom. For argument's sake, I will admit an absurdity—that they might in their immediate *Campus Martius*, suppress our religion;—but the very reason which would lead me to suppose this, damns the notion of their being able to suppress it in any

any other quarter. I declare I am ashamed to be arguing on a point so very childish; but I cannot avoid taking notice of the nonsense that is wrought up to frighten the good Protestant people of Ireland; in the first place, because I have already said I would prove the established religion was not in danger, and that every argument made use of to make us believe so, was groundless and visionary; and in the next place, because I would expose that ignorance which ever delights in disseminating discord. From this specimen of my antagonist's arguments, I have no doubt but statutes will be erected to him, by posterity, when they discover the greatness of his soul, and the sublimity of his understanding.

The next step the Bishop takes to prove the danger of the Protestant religion is to inform us, that in *one instance* they nailed up a church in his diocese, and forbid the curate to officiate; and to make the clerk swear he would not attend him. How he trembles for the ark of the Lord! But why does he not take notice of the many instances wherein chapels were nailed up even on the Sabbath day? The reason is—it is not his interest so to do. I could inform him of several Priests who were treated very inhumanly, and obliged to quit their parishes, sacrificing its emoluments to their preservation. This is as tremendous on the one side, as his *story* on the other. Indeed the poor, oppressed, deluded creatures seem not to be troubled with much religion, and I am very glad of it—for I would rather see a liberality of sentiment, than those prejudices which so long divided the kingdom. We have seen them prefer the church to the chapel, merely out of opposition, though about twenty years ago, they would consider it a
mortal

mortal sin. A mass house!!!—a Popish mob!!!—
for shame, leave those hacknied phrases to Lord
George Gordon. They are beneath your sacred
character, my Lord.

Did ever such words as these proceed from the
mouth of a Bishop before?——“The number of
“persons guilty of capital offences must have
“amounted to thousands, in Munster, yet only
“two were capitally convicted.” Eternal God!
deliver me from such a spirit! which can only be
satiated by a hecatomb. Ah! in the course of jus-
tice, I fear very few of our clergy will be saved.
Surely, with any degree of common decency, one
of them should not dare thus to criminate admini-
stration for its benevolence and moderation.—It
is a new feature in our clergy thus publicly to
vent their thirst for vengeance so contrary to the
precept of their Divine Master, who would rather
advise them when struck on one cheek to turn the
other, and not only to bear their wrongs patiently,
but ask for forgiveness from on high, as they for-
gave trespasses against themselves.

I admit, and give the Bishop great credit for
the observation (perhaps the only judicious one
throughout his pamphlet, and that, by the bye, is
borrowed from the Right Hon. Secretary Orde)
that the present mode of educating the Roman
Catholics of this country calls aloud for some pru-
dent regulation; but at the same time I will not
adopt his idea of the disaffection of that body to our
constitution. I know several Roman Catholics who
prefer a Protestant to a Popish government; and I
really believe all the enlightened Catholics are of
the same way of thinking. I shall beg leave to

make

make a few observations on their conduct as well as that of the Presbyterians, during the last war.

The Roman Catholics of the South, and the Presbyterians in the North, instead of annoying us, took up arms in our defence, at the most important crisis that ever this country saw—a crisis, when in the city of Cork they had not a Soldier, even to mount guard on their Jails, nor had they one in the North to protect them from a threatened invasion, nor in the County of Kerry, where they would have been invaded, had it not been for our spirited Volunteers, many of whom were Roman Catholics;—at the same time when it was rumoured that the French had landed in Bantry, did not all the principal Roman Catholics (who had not at that time been embodied) apply for arms to their Protestant brethren? and did they not keep the city of Cork quiet, whilst the well-disciplined Volunteers marched to Bantry, to engage (as they thought) the enemy? I, myself, at that time, was Lieutenant of the Carbery Independent Company, many of whom were Roman Catholics, and yet the whole corps accompanied me at night, from Skibbereen to Bantry—(fifteen miles) and the Roman Catholics appeared to me as determined as any of the rest.—At Belfast, the Volunteers, who were all Dissenters, marched to Carrickfergus, to prevent Paul Jones from landing, at the time that the immortal Capt. Dobbs was killed;—and the Royal Ulster Volunteers commanded by Sir Barry Denny, (of which corps I was a private) marched to Lragh, and absolutely brought Captain Lunt, (brother-in-law to Paul Jones) and about sixteen Americans, prisoners to Tralee, from whence we conducted them to Cork Jail: Can these people then be called disaffected?—or, is it possible that either State or Church can

F

suffer

suffer harm from men who protected both, when they were not in a condition to protect themselves? at a time when we had waged war, I may say, with all the united forces of America, France and Spain. Ungrateful Prelate!—to attempt to throw a stigma upon a brave and loyal people, who were the means of keeping your crossier in your hand;—and the word crossier makes me smile—to think that there should be an absolute necessity for a Bishop to aver a falsehood, at the very moment of his consecration,——*Noli Episcopari*, no wonder they should think nothing of publishing untruths afterwards, when they began their sacred embassy with one of the most flagrant that could be supposed;—it is well known, that those who are Bishops obtain their Sees through the dint of interest,——no matter through what source. Prostitutes ere now have had the power of bestowing Bishopricks on their *intimates*;—the appointment comes from the Minister; and though the *Reverend Divine* knows some months before that he is to wear the mitre, nay has solicited for it *with all his force*; yet at the awful ceremony, he declares, in the face of his God, that *he won't be a Bishop!* though he accepts of it the next instant;—nor is it merit that ever had any thing to do with a man's advancement to a *Bishopric*,——Mr. Fox certainly happened to stumble on a *worthy man*, when he had the present Bishop of Down appointed; but, I fancy his *moral character* (and an extreme good one he had and has) was no additional recommendation to the *pious Charles*;—who would have been much better pleased had he been an honest *peep of day boy*, who would have accompanied him to *Brothels* and *Gambling-Houses*;—so much for *Episcopacy*—(which I only brought in by way of parenthesis) and now to re-assume the subject, I had been on, when I was interrupted by
the

the *Crozier*;—I know it hath been averred by several and credited by numbers, that “ a *Protestant Government* cannot (with safety) repose any confidence in *Popish Subjects*; the loyalty of their professions being only the sacrifice of equivocation to treachery; and the peaceableness of their conduct being no better than the act of bare necessity, fettered by *fear* and *impotence*;”——this includes a heavy charge; but, how is it supported?—by another *avermment*, equally destitute of proof, and one would think sufficiently refuted, not only by the smallest knowledge of Christianity itself; but even by the *moral sense* of human nature. It is a shame and scandal to be reduced to the necessity of expounding *such a point*: but, my more learned Protestant readers must excuse my going into it. It is said, that *Roman Catholics* can be bound to a Protestant establishment, by no religious tests whatever: that the same obligation of an oath of fidelity hath no power over their consciences, when ever interest and impunity unite against its observance; nay, that *perjury* itself becometh in *some cases*, a meritorious principle.——Were this, indeed, the truth, there certainly would be little complaint, at this time of *Popery* in the world; and the *Church of Rome* would soon be an *empty one*.——Our very nature would start.——With all its depravity, it would be too tender of its own dignity; nay, if its own indepriveable rights, to profess a doctrine useless in this world, after the first detection, and too diabolical even for those who aspire to no better.——But on the contrary, the *Roman Catholic Religion* holds perjury in detestation. Our more knowing Protestants think so.——The law of our land supposes it, and the *Papists* (who surely know best what they believe) aver it *living* and *dying*. For my own part,

I solemnly declare, that (in my time) I have had an immensity of dealing with *Protestant Dissenters*, and with *Roman Catholics* (tho' as I said before I am intimate with few of the latter description) and that I never met with a fairer or juster people;—I never was cheated, belied, or betrayed by one of them; would to Heaven! I was able to say the same of my *Brethren of the established Church*! by the infidelity of one of them, though in my power, I lost my employments in *Munster*; by the artifice and invidious duplicity of another, (assisted by a *Reverend Dean*, who shall be nameless for the honor of the cloth) I lost my *Survey* in the North; by the inhumanity and unheard of barbarity of another, I lost a *Barrack Master's Place*, which the great and good *Lord Hillsborough* would have obtained for me, had it not been for the underband interference of the monster alluded to, on whom a just judgment fell some short time afterwards: and indeed, since the infamous transaction, the smiling Tyrant and his whole family have never enjoyed a moment's peace or ease of mind. One misfortune, in quick rotation, still succeeding the other.

How nobly did the *Dissenters* of the North behave to my unfortunate self (though I had apparently, by a villain's manœuvres, for near two years before abandoned their cause). On my dismissal (which every body in this kingdom, of information, I believe, knows was without any cause whatever, either of peculation or neglect of duty)—I owed about three hundred pounds in the town of Belfast—and all, except one debt, to *Dissenters*, who the instant they heard of my ruin, and that I meant to cant off my effects, in order

to satisfy them, called a meeting among themselves, and generously (without any solicitation from me) struck off the thirds of their demands, taking *five shillings and eight pence* in the pound, which was in fact presenting me with *two hundred pounds*;—and had they not behaved thus greatly—what must have been the consequence?—or, how could I have maintained myself and family for these two long years, that I am out of any employment?—the little effects which my generous creditors left me, have been my whole support. One only, a *gentleman of the established church*, the instant he heard of my misfortune, demanded my bond, entered judgment immediately upon it—and (were it not that he was *shamed* out of the matter, by the rest of the town) would (like Shylock) have made me pay to the utmost farthing, nay what is worse, would have obliged me to pay twenty pounds more than I owed him;—believe me, when I declare, that “I nothing extenuate—or set down
“ought in malice.”

At the late *Revolution*, incapacities were laid on *Religious Dissenters* in this kingdom, in regard to employments in the State and Magistratical Offices—No other were then imposed; industry and property were laid under no legal interdicts: the true spirit of the Revolution prevailed; and its greatest enemies began to be reconciled to it.—The Protestant interest flourished, because the interest of the nation flourished also. But in Queen Ann's reign, we deviated all on a sudden from that policy. The Papists who opposed King William's government, were obedient under her's.—This however availed nothing: he pardoned; she punished. An universal languor, amidst all our successes abroad, and a profound peace at home,

home, spread over the face of our Island. The memory of those calamitous days is too fresh to need any revival at present, nor can we justly lay all our sufferings, during that period, to the Popery acts alone. But we may say, with great truth, that the restrictions on industry and property were, at that juncture in particular, extremely unreasonable. Our linen manufacture did not take sufficient root; England laid our trade under new limitations; our military art became mighty expensive, by the exportation of our troops;—all our credit was almost sunk;—and the years 1709 and 1710, added a wretched famine to all our distresses. We revived in the next reign, through some favourable conjunctures; we threw a little in the last; but the *Popery laws* prevailed over all our efforts, and kept us more or less in a hectic state.

From the year seventeen hundred and four, until the Papists were lately granted some indulgences, did they ever give cause for all the sufferings which this nation incurred on their account? on the contrary, no people in any age or country ever behaved more dutifully or resignedly;—and were ever the *Protestant Dissenters* known to have behaved improperly, disloyally, or rebelliously?—no never;—the *insurrections* of the Steel Boys of the North were occasioned by *disputes* (of overgrown fortunes) canting for the farms (which had run out of lease) of their poorest neighbours; at a time when Mr. Talbot was settling Lord Donegal's lands, when the moneyed Dissenters perfectly knew the way to feel the agent's pulse.—At that time, no established clergymen were insulted or attacked, nor was the object, Tithes; and the only particular outrages that were committed, were

were the setting fire to Mr. *Cunningham's* house at Belfast, and the killing of Mr. Morell, a Dissenting Minister; now as both these gentlemen were Dissenters, the learned Prelate cannot possibly say that ever the Steel Boys intended the smallest injury to Church or State;—the Quakers also compose a part of the two great Bodies of Dissenters, who are such a terror to the Prelate; are not the Quakers the most inoffensive, and the most harmless people on earth?—Quakers assume no dignities! no consequence!—no parade!—They are a meek, modest, mild people, who would wish to deport themselves like Primitive Christians, nor have I heard that a real Quaker was ever guilty of a crime, for which he could be arraigned at the Bar of Justice; the Seceders of the North are also a very praise-worthy People; in short, no People are more depraved than those who profess the same Religion with the Bishop and myself;—and what can that be owing to? simply to this,—the inattention of our own Clergy; they take no sort of heed of our morals; and if we happen to be poor, or to move in an humble sphere of life, they turn up their *snouts* at us, and pass us by, as if we had been inferior animals; nay worse, as if we had not been created by the same God who created themselves.

I assert no man, but a prejudiced man would suspect the loyalty of Presbyterians or Catholics; they have given proofs of their attachment to the present Government which should be recorded to their immortal honors—proofs that entitle them to a different return from every true-hearted Protestant, than that which they have received at the hands of the Prelate. But ingratitude's the growth of every clime—it is not confined to any nation or age;

age; however, I have confidence in the gentlemen who preside at the helm of our affairs, that they look on those people with proper sentiments of affection, and that no character however respectable, will influence them to change the opinion they entertain of them. In the hour of necessity they demonstrated a willingness to present their bosoms to the bayonet of a foreign or domestic enemy; and it is to them we may return thanks that our island was not invaded by the French. Let it never be forgotten my fellow Protestants—let it be written on your hearts in sentiments of gratitude, that at the time Marschal Broglio was at Brest, with an army of twenty thousand picked men, and every preparation made for an embarkation, in order to make a descent on Ireland, the very idea of our general unanimity determined the cabinet of Versailles to countermand the expedition. Had the Roman Catholics shewed a disposition at that awful crisis, even to observe a neutrality, it is easy to foresee what would have been the consequence. The army of a nation flushed with the divisions and distresses of their most formidable rival would have menaced the conquest of Ireland. I shall not take upon myself to decide with what success their efforts might have been crowned, but I shall beg the indulgence of my readers, while I recount a few circumstances, of the truth of which they can form no doubt—some of them must be in their own recollection.

A short time previous to the French Ambassador's delivery of his rescript to the Court of London, a gentleman distinguished for his benevolent feelings, moved in our House of Commons for some little indulgence for the Roman Catholics of this country. I am ashamed to mention the reception his motion met with—it was scouted out
of

of the house, almost unanimously. However, in about a week or fortnight afterwards, the news arrived of the French rescript being announced to both houses of the British Parliament, and the consequent determination of proceeding to hostilities. Mr. Gardiner then immediately moved for heads of a bill for the relief the Roman Catholics,—leave was granted by a great majority—and the bill carried, though strenuously opposed by some short-sighted politicians. The account of this operated as a thunder-bolt in France, whose object or at least whose apparent object was to render this country independent of Britain—a measure exceedingly feasible, from the great number of inhabitants who were unjustly oppressed by a code of laws which one of the greatest politicians in the world has justly asserted, were written *in characters of blood*. To such a power as the French, I say the measure was feasible; they could have sent any force they thought proper into our country—they had officers from every county, whose connections would have been on such an occasion of the utmost importance—the prejudices of the vulgar were all in their favour—of the vulgar did I say? alas! the most enlightened, circumstanced as they were, would have acted in the same manner, that it was but natural to suppose they would have done. The generality of Priests, all over the kingdom received their education in France, of course, it might very well be thought they would not have been unfriendly to a cause, from which they had much to expect. Add to all those reasons for inducing the French to such a procedure, that their situation favoured the enterprize, and that the parent state was unable to afford us the least protection. If the Roman Catholics were hostile

G to

to our glorious constitution, what more favourable opportunity could they require to subvert Church and State? What more favourable opportunity could present itself to them for recovering all the rights of which they had been despoiled, by the infractions of the conditions of Limerick? Their conduct was singularly loyal and gives the lie direct to every insinuation to their dishonour. They offered their services to their Protestant brethren, who gladly encouraged them to the Volunteer standard. Every individual seemed animated with loyalty and patriotism, and the French found themselves disappointed in the assistance of a people from whom they expected the most important services.

It is impossible for me to use any argument to prove the attachment of the Roman Catholics more forcibly than their own conduct at that period.— It was such as demonstrated their loyalty to be as sincere as any of their fellow-subjects whatever.— It was the opinion of many well-informed men, that France never would have undertaken that war were it not in the hope of disuniting Ireland from England, and no human power could frustrate their designs, but the Roman Catholics themselves. If their tried and approved affection can raise them in our esteem, we ought to hold them in the most friendly point of view. We ought not implicitly to adopt opinions injurious to them without a previous investigation—and

“What can we reason but from what we know?”

If our sentiments of them be formed from our knowledge and experience of them, we cannot withhold our admiration and respect for that virtuous and upright body, who have been long neglected and de-
spised

spised, by those to whom they have a right to look up to for relief.

Away then with those hacknied and shameful conclusions that a Roman Catholic cannot be sincere in his professions of attachment to our constitution and common sovereign—that he must relinquish every religious tenet he has imbibed, ere he can with well to either—ere he can keep faith with us—ere he can be bound to the observance of the most solemn obligations. Let us not recur to the dark ages of ignorance and superstition, when temporal policy directed the consciences of men. It is enough for us such scenes cannot in the nature of things ever be repeated. Even in the days I allude to, much has been exaggerated to their disgrace. We now behold them approaching to the tolerant principles of which it has been the glory of Protestants to have laid the foundation. I feel for the man who to support a tottering cause is obliged to scurrility, and the most palpable falsehoods for arguments, to give feasibility to his production, evidently dictated by self preservation, and a resentment for which he never experienced, aught to justify.

“When falsehood’s insolent, let truth be bold.”

Have Protestants always kept faith with Roman Catholics, I ask you, holy man, for whom, after all, I entertain some respect on account of your sacred habit, principally;—have they always kept faith with them I say?—Ah! my Lord, I need not take you out of this country, to prove the converse. Irishmen were ever warmly attached to their King, however unworthy he might have been of their regard. Look back to the reign of Elizabeth—look back to the reign of the First Charles.

—and to that of the ill-fated James. What right had they to be so faithful to the Stuart family, whose uniform conduct was such as would justify a rebellious spirit in them as well as in the rest of their fellow-subjects?—For my part I am astonished when I reflect on the history of the Irish Catholics, than whom, under Heaven, there is not a people more misrepresented or belied. Borlace, Temple and my Lord Clarendon, (who by the bye was an honest meaning man than either of the other two, and indeed, it is paying his memory no compliment to say so) though they all reprobate the poor Papists differ in the most important events recorded in their *stories*. I believe the noble author was deceived or he would have been an impartial historian, but as to Borlace and Temple they wrote in defence of their own characters, which were blackened by the atrociousness of their deeds.

The Irish bled willingly and profusely for James, even after he had deserted them—they disputed William's sovereignty when shut up in Limerick—the last dyke of that poltroon's dominions—a poltroon I say, for he should have rather died, than abandon such subjects at the time he did. Their noble defence of that city will ever be the admiration of the greatest martinets. Though in every extremity of hunger and distress, they refused to hearken to terms while they had a hope of success; and when all expectations of foreign assistance failed them; they resolved on an act of desperation, or else to obtain terms worthy of themselves. The articles on which they surrendered is a proof of this. They resigned their liberties and arms for stipulated privileges, solemnly signed and sealed. However, all those articles were afterwards violated by Queen Ann, and the most oppressive laws enacted in place of

of them. The properties and persons of Roman Catholics to the indelible shame of that reign, were exposed to every danger and insult.—The child was encouraged to plunge a dagger in the heart of his aged father—the marriage bed, that last asylum of human joys and consolation, was not considered too sacred for the stern arm of persecution.

The conduct of those writers who are continually *preaching*, that Roman Catholics consider themselves not bound to keep faith with us, is very reprehensible. They should examine our conduct with respect to them before they imputed so injurious a charge. The unfortunate Mary of Scotland, bled for her credulity in depending on the good faith of Elizabeth of England, who invited her with apparent sincerity and affection to the Court of London, but the moment that unhappy Queen arrived in her dominions, instead of alleviating her misfortunes, she basely had her person seized as a culprit, confined her in a Castle far from her metropolis, and after an imprisonment of near twenty years, brought her at last to trial for supposed treason, and doomed her to death by a concerted, deliberate and systematical procedure, on a public scaffold. Innumerable are the instances I could adduce to prove the violations of faith on the part of Protestants; but the fate of the conditions of Limerick, precludes the necessity of entering more fully on that point. I thus publicly call on the right rev. Bishop for an opinion relative to the right or propriety of such an infraction of the terms on which the Roman Catholics submitted to the arms of William. I call on him to come forward once more and prove that it could be made without any violation of faith. But I am satisfied I urge him to an impossibility, and therefore shall decline

declined pressing him on this occasion. For my part I firmly believe that justice as well as humanity forbade the enacting of Penal Laws beyond the letter of the conditions originally granted them—Penal Laws which impoverished our country, and banished many of our brave countrymen, whose wisdom and bravery in the cabinet and field have been the scourge of our parent state—Penal Laws, which contrary to the voice of God and nature, encouraged the child to rebel against his father, which broke the heart of many an amiable character, and sent them to untimely graves—Penal Laws which burst asunder the strongest and most sacred of human ties, that of matrimony, and left unhappy females of the Roman Catholic communion, exposed to destruction from the perfidy of every villain who by complying with the forms of their religion, could despoil them of their honour and property together. O! what a melancholy account could I give of the operation of this law which still disgraces our country! How many prostitutes have been made by it, of innocent young creatures who have been deceived by the artifices of a designing knave, often without the knowledge of their parents or guardians, to bestow their hands in a marriage that was thought of but to sanction seduction and robbery! How many families have been plunged into all the miseries incident to humanity—how many have been bastardised by this iniquitous law, and left to pine in wretchedness and want! The solemnities of religion were rendered subservient to the purposes of fornication and adultery—and all this *for the security of the Protestant religion*. Roman Catholics have often violated faith for the good of their church—and have not we violated faith for the good of ours. My Lord! my Lord! look over the Popery laws impartially,—

Detest

Detest as you please his principles—but have compassion for the man—and if not on the man at least for the *weaker vessel*—that poor frail being woman—and protect her chastity and her property by an efficient law, and your name will be ever hallowed by the virgins of this land.

Imagine not my readers that I am of opinion the Roman Catholics owe no allegiance to the House of Brunswick. To Anne they certainly did not, and had they revolted their proceedings merited not the name of rebellion. Ah! my Protestant and Presbyterian brethren, who willingly would spill the last drop of your blood for LIBERTY, and whose forefathers devoted their lives to the extirpation of tyranny, would you not rather applaud than condemn the exertions of savages to gain freedom for themselves! and could you reprobate your own fellow-subjects and countrymen for possessing sentiments so congenial to your own, had they even revolted when their compact was broken. Indeed, they have already in a great measure emerged from what they formerly were—though they profess not the Protestant religion, they pathetically feel its influence; and the nearer they approach to it, the more information they acquire, and the farther they will be removed from their original principles, so disgraceful to the dignity of human nature.—Philanthropy advises lenient measures, which are the most certain that can be adopted, to save them from the artifices of an ignorant priesthood, who are indebted for their dominion over the consciences of their flocks to our impolicy in denying them a liberal education. Previous to the mitigation of the penal code, the records of so many years, only handed to us about four thousand converts, and since that period they have increased in a comparative

tive ratio of one to three. Does not this demonstrate a generous spirit in that people whose pride would not permit them to reform till they could do so without injuring their characters by an imputation of mercenary considerations—till their conversion might be attributed to principle alone.

Since the accession of the present family to the British throne, they were always friendly to the Roman Catholics. It was the abominable Stuart race who oppressed that people. His present Majesty, whom God Almighty long preserve, possesses principles of toleration worthy the King of a free people; and I might also observe that the principal personages of his confidence and councils have been distinguished for their liberality of sentiment. Every person must recollect that when fanaticism lit the torch that set his metropolis in flames, the first characters of the law, church, and state, were the devoted objects of the rioters, for no other reason than their being the friends of toleration. While the horrid deed spread on "eagles wings" this circumstance was considered throughout Europe as the noblest compliment that could be paid to his Majesty's government.

It is absurd, it is ridiculous to the last degree to suppose that Presbyterians and Papists would wish the subversion of the present government and of our religion because their mode of worship is not the established one of the state. Is it probable any event of that nature would render their situation better? The Presbyterians are an enlightened people, and recollect that they obtained no advantages by the demolition of Church and State in the reign of that unhappy man Charles I. I appeal to the Bishop's candor, if that people were not among the foremost for recalling Monarchy, and

and though they were most ungratefully and undeservedly put under great disabilities afterwards, on account of their religious opinions, they have never been surpassed by any other description of his Majesty's subjects in their zeal for the support of the constitution.

But the Prelate makes no allowance whatever for the approved loyalty of either of those very respectable bodies, because he considers them inimical to Tithes. He attacks them both with violence and invective, without regard either to candor or consistency: the principles of Presbyterians tend to subvert order and "pull down an ecclesiastical establishment;" *ergo*, he opposes them; on the contrary, the principles of the Roman Catholics "tend to set up" what Presbyterians would pull down, and *ergo*, he opposes them; and confidently asserts "from these premises, the conclusion is manifest; and in such times the plain truth must be spoken, and it is for the essential interest of the Protestant Dissenter, that the truth should be proclaimed, that of the three persuasions, the members of the established church alone, can be cordial friends to the entire constitution of this realm, with perfect consistency of principle. And without such consistency, no body of men can be intitled to national confidence." His *premises* remind me of the story of a poor old man, his son, and his ass. Going into a town they both rode on the ass, till people shouted shame for both to ride on the creature at once. The old man alight, and his son was soon after booted for riding and letting his poor old father walk. The son alight and the old man mounted, but he was also censured for riding, and letting his son walk. They both then

H

walked,

walked, and nevertheless they were ridiculed by the mob. The old man still willing to please all, if in his power, got two poles, and with the assistance of his son, carried the ass; but all to no purpose, they were then reprobated for their folly and absurdity. So it is in some measure with my adversary, for let the Presbyterians or Roman Catholics hold what tenets they may; however opposite and contradictory, by a retrograde manœuvre, he wheels about and twists and twines them to his purpose, with more dexterity than a slight of hand man. But it is unnecessary for me to be dwelling on such nonsense. However, I must take notice of the insult he offers to the understanding of the Presbyterians in the quotation just mentioned, wherein he says it is for their essential interest they should be informed of a truth, which is neither more or less than that they cannot be entitled to national confidence; and he subjoins a very *modest* request in the succeeding paragraph, that they will impute *his reflections* to the unhappy circumstances of the times, and not to a want of that liberal and christian spirit of toleration, which he feels in his breast !!!

In truth, I could write a whole volume on the many inconsistencies I observed in his pamphlet; notwithstanding the rapid sale it has experienced. I hope I have proved to the satisfaction of my readers, that all his arguments for the insecurity of the Protestant religion are groundless and visionary: In the firm persuasion, at least, that I have said enough to convince any candid, dispassionate man that they are so, I shall proceed to some general observations on the subject.

SECTION III.

IN the advertisement to the reader, which precedes the pamphlet, that induced me to take up the pen, the author remarks, he had seen an address to the nobility and gentry of Ireland by a layman; in which many of the observations in his tract are anticipated with so much ability that the author would have struck them out, if they had not been necessary to the chain of his argument. I flatter myself I have sufficiently exposed the futility of his argument, if he can call it his, which was the layman's, and every other person's who ever wrote on the subject. Indeed the argument he speaks of has been so often made use of, that there was no occasion for him to take the trouble of writing his pamphlet. He should rather have republished the Farmer's Letters, Free Thoughts, &c. wherein are contained all the arguments he employed with respect to Popery, and a great many more beside. Though he compliments the layman for his abilities, I declare I consider him as a stupid blockhead, who substituted abuse and virulence for information and fair reasoning; besides being one of the most notorious plagiarist that ever put pen to paper. Notwithstanding my opinion of the Bishop's talents is not very elevated, I declare I look on him as a

bright luminary in the republic of letters, compared with the wretched scribbler of that vile heap of trash alluded to. The only thing I can perceive in it, is the robbery of innumerable authors and a sanguinary propensity for persecution. Indeed it served for a proper introduction for the Bishop's *peace-breathing mite*, which was executed in a violent hurry, as he cautiously observes with all the modesty of a virgin, who urges the hacknied excuse of a very great cold, when called on for a song. Nothing is more common than excuses of this nature; and lest I should forget (for there are so many ideas floating in my imagination that on my conscience I cannot pen the half of them) to apologize for the many inaccuracies I have been guilty of, before I go any farther I will assure you, gentle reader, that I never read a line of my M. S. but sent them to the press hot from my brain. Besides which, I wrote on as the compositors wanted copy; for they and I were at work together; this will be a sufficient excuse if I have treated on any subject twice, which to the best of my memory I endeavoured to avoid.

To the chain of his argument!!! Immortal Berkley, how much beneath thy benevolent heart wouldst such a chain be! If it is possible that thy gentle spirit could look down from Heaven on thy successor, certain I am it would be with sentiments of pity. I myself lament the part he has acted from the respect I bear him, and ardently pray he may renounce such illiberal doctrine, and become like unto thee, who wert the enlightened Christian and Philosopher.

But I must inform my reader of a report that I have heard; which is, that the layman is the same
con-

contemptible scribe who formerly rendered himself somewhat conspicuous for his abominable libels against one of the first characters in this kingdom. Originally he was the son of a parish schoolmaster, who lived and died a Roman Catholic, notwithstanding he was apparently a Protestant. This *Spem Gregis* was early put as a shop-boy to a linen draper, where he behaved himself but *so so*. However he got into another situation afterwards, by the humanity of a gentleman to whom he was very ungrateful. He soon assumed the airs of nobility and the affectation of a pedant. And his conduct drew upon him the execrations of those who were so unhappy as to be connected in any wise with him, justifying in every instance the vulgar adage "set a beggar on horseback and he'll ride to the devil." As it would be utterly impossible for me to add a trait of deformity to his character or vices, I shall only repeat the following lines, which were written on him some time ago; and all who know the *thing*, for it would be a prostitution of my own nature to call him a man, acknowledge the justice and propriety of the satire:—

— Disdaining all disguise,
 Displays his meanness in his eyes;
 And is so much devoid of art,
 His very visage speaks his heart;
 Some share of praise is sure his due,
 Who looks a rogue and is one too.

Such is the doughty hero who *steps out* before the Bishop to blow the trumpet of persecution; though his own brother is a priest in France, and all the relations he has in the world are Roman Catholics.—True indeed he would not acknowledge them

them because they are poor; but if they were in affluence he would, like Macklin's Man of the World, be always a *boeing* to them. Oh! you unhappy wretch, who have not an individual you can call, brother, sister, cousin, or a relation of any sort whatever—nay not a friend if we except the Bishop, and another Prelate. What a miserable situation is this for a rational being!

I declare I would not take any notice of the pitiful wretch if the Bishop had not done him the honor of mentioning his pamphlet. He is beneath my notice. Nor would I write against the Bishop, only he is a respectable character. Descended from a long line of ancestors, some of whom were enobled, and possessed of an independent fortune, he must be considered in a very different light from the miserable layman. More I will say for the Bishop that he is charitable and in private life exemplary—the only objection I have to him is on account of his intolerant principles.

The bloody minded Theophilus—that execrable villain who should be hunted as a pest from all human society—is extolled to the skies by this Bishop. He says he is an able writer, (though as I before remarked, he is but a mere *puffer* of other writers) and also that his zeal for the preservation of the Protestant religion is entitled to the warmest gratitude from every friend of it, whether lay, like himself, or clerical like the Bishop. His thirst of blood is *monstrously justified* in the sentence that “*apprehensions for the safety of religion will naturally excite a warmth.*” The Lord deliver me from such a *warmth* good Prelate—it was a *warmth* your friend's old father the parish school-master never felt. However it is highly pleasing to you
who

who seem almost in as great a *beat* yourself, and consequently are as well entitled to the *warmest gratitude* for your *zeal* in the preservation of Protestantism. In pretty plain terms Theophilus asserts, that poor O'Leary is an agitating friar and a Romish missionary, sent hither to sow sedition and spirit up a Popish banditti; and that he absolutely merits hanging more than Sheehy, who was formerly hanged and quartered in Clonmel, not for heading White-Boys, as that ignorant lying scribbler asserts, but for the murder of John of the bridge, as he was called; though he was as innocent of it as the child unborn. Indeed it is my opinion he was guilty of some irregularities—more I will say, perhaps he mixed with, and countenanced White-Boys. But it is absurd to suppose he was guilty of the murder for which he suffered. In the first place it could never be properly ascertained that such a man was ever murdered. That such a man existed I allow—I often saw him and gave him a charity—that he was missing and never heard of I also allow; but does it follow he was murdered by the unhappy Sheehy? The poor wretch was a foundling, and took his name from the bridge on which he had been found. He grew up a fool, and was supported by the charity of the peasantry about Kelfennin, Clougheen and Ballypooreen.—It is repugnant to the nature of man to suppose, Sheehy would murder him without having some object in view. But had he been an eye witness of his encouraging White-Boyism, his evidence would not have been competent to affect any man's life, nor could any judge admit of his examination.—What end then could it answer to Sheehy to embroe his hands in the blood of a begging idiot—or, after having murdered him to carry his corpse tied up in a bag before him on his horse in triumph,
all

all over the county of Tipperary. See how a plain tale rescues the memory of that persecuted Priest from the malice of his accusers. He was convicted on the testimony of a common prostitute; or rather sacrificed to the prejudices of the times. So intent were some gentlemen on having him hanged, that I doubt not but they would like Fitzgerald, give up a few lives to accomplish their popular purpose; and it is a fact that a visible judgment fell on them afterwards, for they all died in undescribable misery. However, he was the only clergyman out of the peal of the established church that ever I recollect to have heard of suffering, except for celebrating mass; and I believe Theophilus considers that a crime heinous enough to merit the *good offices* of a topsman, which I very much fear will be his fate sooner or later—the Lord convert him, from his wicked ways! Many hundred of Priests have been hanged, cut down alive, ripped open, their hearts and bowels thrown in their faces, ere the lamp of life was totally extinct—then thrown into a fire and burned to ashes, and their limbs severed and treated with all possible ignominy, both in England and Ireland, though no other offence had been proved against them than the practice of such superstition as was introduced into England by Austin, who first converted it from heathenism to christianity, about the year 598. As to a dissenting minister, I never heard of one of them who suffered for any foul deed. But let us turn to the established clergy—Eternal God! what do we behold? not a crime that was ever recorded in a newgate calander, or that ever disgraced humanity, that some of them have not either suffered for, or at least been indicted for;—*forgeries, robberies, perjuries, rapes, adulteries, murders, suicide!*—nay, gentle reader, do not start or turn pale at the horrid recital, there is not
a crime

a crime specified in the above *black schedule*, that I could not this moment produce a case in point to prove my assertions; and I could name each man individually who had been guilty of each particular crime; but did I do so, I must hurt the feelings of many particular friends for whom I have the greatest esteem;—nay what is more, I should be obliged to name a relation of my own amongst the delinquents. On my word they are in general a disgrace to the national religion; and I fear they will ever continue so until their princely revenues are abridged to a standard similar to that in Scotland. It is horrible to reflect on their conduct, and to think at the same time that the church lands of this kingdom alone are more than double the entire revenues of a thousand clergymen in Scotland, infinitely their superiors, as I before observed, in piety and learning. O! ye Senators take this subject into your most serious consideration, and leave not thousands upon thousands of your countrymen in misery on their account. Remember the advice of St. Peter to the Elders, to feed the flock of Christ and to take the oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly; and not for *filthy lucre*.—Ye younger submit yourselves to the elders; yea all of ye be subject to one another, and be cloathed with humility; for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble—*ergo*, he has given very little grace to the generality of our clergy, but he resisteth the most of them, as undoubtedly there are not prouder people under the canopy of Heaven than they are in general—indeed, they are so much so that I have with horror, observed some of them turn up their noses in the administration of the elements to the poorer sort of people.

I am ashamed to mention Theophilus and the Bishop together, but I cannot avoid it: They have
I both

both mangled O'Leary's writings and perverted them in a most ill-natured manner—one has asserted him to be the fomentor of sedition “an agitating “friar,” who ought to be hanged; the other does not say so much indeed; but he says it would be very difficult—nay he carries it to an impossibility, to prove the contrary, because it is a *negative proposition*. He does not say O'Leary was sent hither on purpose to sow sedition; but his letters he asserts are calculated, and most artfully contrived to produce such an effect; and then proceeds to quotations from his letters to which he affixes a plausible meaning, diametrically opposite to the original. I will not enter into the defence of that Gentleman; he is able and no doubt willing to defend himself. However, I consider it absolutely scandalous to make such partial extracts from his productions. Were I but disposed to serve the Bishop in the same manner he served poor O'Leary I would convince my readers, that his pamphlet was levelled against the Protestants of Ireland instead of the Presbyterians or Papists. But as assertion is nothing, I will just give one example how I might dissect his *reflections* as he calls them:—

“It is evident (says he) that the National
“clergy are not paid by their parishioners, but by
“the public and consequently the complaints made
“by some of the Dissenters of both communions,
“ (that is, the Presbyterians and Priests) or rather
“by others for them, that they pay two clergymen,
“are ill-founded.” This is a position not only
perfectly ridiculous, but perfectly astonishing that
it could proceed from a man *compós mentis*.

Vene-

Venerable Prelate, it is not disputed but Tithes are paid by the public, which God of his infinite mercy grant may not long be the case; but I cannot comprehend your meaning when you say they are not paid by the parishioners of a parish. Ah, the most acute and indubitable of the human senses, emphatically contradicts you—the Parishioners *feel*—they are made to *feel*—that they do pay Tithes, to the very letter of the law, which humanity should consign to oblivion; therefore, the assertion that they do pay two clergymen is *not ill-founded*. But he says the complaints are not made by the Dissenters of either communion; but, *by others for them*; who then can those *others* be but Protestants? Is it not plain—is it not evident that neither Presbyterians or Papists were included in the word *others*. I do not say the Bishop intended to clear them—the contrary is the fact. However he has done so to all intents and purposes; and I appeal to every unimpassioned man in the kingdom, whether any other meaning can be taken from the word, *others*, than that which I have taken—and I also appeal to them whether it was not ungenerous to the last degree to abuse two respectable bodies for crimes which they never committed (i. e. complaints against Tithes) but which were the entire work of *others for them*. His pamphlet is written in the spirit of resentment—for which he avows he has had no just cause— notwithstanding the great circulation it has had, I fear very few will understand it. The same inducement—an idle curiosity, operates in its favour, as occasioned so many editions of Twiss's tour in Ireland. At least his pamphlet will bear as many

many constructions as any of Homer's writings, of which Swift remarks,

“That learned Commentators view

“In Homer, more than Homer knew.”

In justice to O'Leary, I must insist he has used every argument which could have been *rational*ly employed to deter the deluded Rightboys from their outrages. The most powerful reasons he assigned to influence them. He proved to them that their barbarous excesses could answer no other end, than that of subjecting them to the death of a jibber, besides doing the most important injury to their cause. And although the Bishop sneers at his making a tender of his services to the Protestant clergy, to me it appears the strongest proof of the sincerity of his intentions. But what would be praiseworthy in another, is reprobated as the act of a liberal and well-meaning man;—a man esteemed by all ranks and degrees of Christians;—a man who has been a peace-maker, and a leveller of unnatural distinctions, now, to my knowledge, near twenty years. For my part I have read all that gentleman's works, and could never perceive any thing in them exceptionable, but quite to the contrary. He certainly admits the peasantry are aggrieved; and can any man deny it?—are they not the most miserable fellows under heaven? Each of them are obliged to pay forty shillings for his sty and potatoe-garden, and this he clears by working it out with his landlord, at four-pence a day; as for his own ridge of potatoes—the sole support of himself and family, that he is obliged to till on Sundays. Is it not cruel then to exact the tenth of his only support—of his whole year's labour, and the labour of his wretched

wretched helpmate? Surely the benefited clergy and fat plutarians, should rather charitably relieve those sons and daughters of affliction, than oppress them.

There is another grievance, under which the peasantry labour, which has distressed them exceedingly—the taking in and enclosing all the common-ages of the province of Munster: within these twenty years, it became fashionable for gentlemen of property to take possession of every commons contiguous to their estates, and drive the poor peasant's piggs and geese off, and annex them to their own lands; this was originally the cause of their risings, and hence it was that they were called Levellers, from their assembling at night and levelling those barriers, constructed by tyrants to deprive them of Deodands, which the poor had held peaceable possession of for time immemorial. I remember myself large tracts of land, in commonage even in my time, in the county of Tipperary, and which had been the chief support of many poor families, walled in by gentlemen of fortune, who without the least ceremony, precluded the poor from any benefit or participation whatever. In this instance the clergy themselves should have interfered, and prevented such act of oppression, instead of which, however, they encouraged and united with the powerful and oppulent in such depredations on the property of the miserable and helpless children of affliction and property.

Thus it appears evidently, that the peasantry of Ireland were not the original aggressors; but that their first insurrections were owing to violations of the laws on the part of their superiors.

I was

I was ever of opinion that religion always suffered by disputation, and that it is highly imprudent for one communion to display the absurdity of another. Wranglings of this sort have frequently shaken christianity to its center; and made infidels of men who otherwise might have lived and died within the pale of either religion. I am convinced, from observations and reflections on men and things, that the only true way of making converts from Popery, is "neither to encourage or discourage it; but to cultivate literature." If this were the policy of those who advised Penal Laws, certain I am the Papists at this day would not form one third of their present number. It is almost impossible controversy can ever convince men nurtured in prejudices. I grant the absurdity of the Romish religion can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of any impartial man; but the arguments employed to this end, if geometrically applied, will be also found to strike at the root of the religion which opposes it. On this account I very much condemn the principle of introducing the oath of a Popish Bishop at his consecration, in the Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet. — It naturally leads us to think of that taken by the Protestant Bishops; and the same reason which induce us to condemn the former, will not lead us to admire the latter. I am always shocked at the recollection of the conduct of those clergymen who canvass for a Bishopric in this or the sister kingdom — with my whole heart I condemn the procedure which is little better than a mockery of the Supreme Being. I shall just my reader give you a sketch of the process: — Before even any vacancy occurs, a clergyman who has interest with government exerts every nerve to obtain a promise from the minister, which sometimes he obtains, and sometimes he does not; however, on the demise of a

LAW I

Bishop,

Bishop, there are many candidates, who, like the evil one's apothecary, become doubly diligent.—The celebrated Mr. Fox never laboured more strenuously to circumvent his great rival Mr. Pitt, than they do to circumvent each other. However, the minister generally determines on the object very speedily, which is almost invariably the man, however unworthy, who has most interest. As soon as his choice is fixed, a *conge d'elire*, by royal authority, passes the great seal, empowering the dean and chapter of the vacant Bishopric to elect a Bishop of that see. But this is only a farce, for the person is nominated by the minister whom they are to elect. However, they appoint a day when they meet in the church, and invoke the assistance of Jesus Christ, in the most solemn manner, to direct them in their determination, though in fact they have no more power to prefer a man they might deem worthy than I have; for they dare not oppose the will of the minister. Reader, will you account this a species of blasphemy? When this *pious* address to their Saviour is finished, they elect the person whom the minister had directed them; and after supplicating Christ for his light and grace, to direct them in a choice they have no liberty in making—a choice already made for them by the minister—another day, by the same authority, is appointed for the consecration; and then comes on a scene, if possible, more painful to a contemplative Christian than even the preceding. But I have already hinted at that, therefore it is unnecessary for me to dwell any farther on it at present—I only alluded to it now, in order to shew my reader, abominable as the oath of a Popish Bishop may be;—it is possible it may be equalled by those who boast a more enlightened education, but the *mole* can be easier discerned in the eye of another, than the
beam

stem in that of the censor:—an instance of which we also see in Theophilus, who is angry with O'Leary, for not being of higher descent, though the obscurity of his own birth cannot be exceeded. In that respect he should have been particularly delicate, not only on his own account, but on that of one of his friends, not the Bishop of Cloyne, but the other Prelate I alluded to before, who, like Theophilus, descended from the lowest dregs of human nature, his father, who was the *hope* of all his family, being only a coachman to the Duke of Dorset.

In the hope a publication of my observations, on a subject of the first importance to the nation, may at this crisis be productive of some salutary effects, in exciting the commiseration of the legislature for the wretched peasantry, who are plunged into outrages, not by a disaffected spirit to church or state, but by the most pressing necessities of nature, I have been induced to step forward; and should I have the happiness of being instrumental in alleviating their miseries, I shall deem it the greatest glory of my life.

— I have no objection to my name being inserted in the title-page of the work, as it is a common custom, and I have already seen many instances of it. But I have already said, that I have no objection to my name being inserted in the title-page of the work, as it is a common custom, and I have already seen many instances of it. But I have already said, that I have no objection to my name being inserted in the title-page of the work, as it is a common custom, and I have already seen many instances of it.

